New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials —Advertisements

Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations

WEDNESDAY, MAY 22, 1918

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York Corporation. Ogden Reid, President; G. Vernor Rogers, Vice-President; Richard H. Lee, Secretary; F. A. Suter, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone, Beekman 3000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York:

IN THE UNITED STATES OUTSIDE OF GREATER NEW YORK

	1 yr.	6 mo.	3 mo.	1 mo.
Daily and Sunday	$9.50	$4.75	$2.50	$0.85
Daily only	7.00	3.50	1.75	.60
Sunday only	3.00	1.50	.75	.30

CANADIAN RATES

Daily and Sunday	$10.00	$5.00	$2.50	$1.00
Daily only	7.00	3.50	1.75	.60
Sunday only	5.00	2.50	1.25	.50

FOREIGN RATES

Daily and Sunday	$24.00	$12.00	$6.00	$2.00
Daily only	18.00	9.00	4.50	1.50
Sunday only	7.00	3.50	1.75	.60

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter

GUARANTEE

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

Understanding the English

At no time since the war began for us has there been a greater necessity for understanding our allies, and particularly for understanding our British ally, than at the present moment. Britain is passing through a supreme crisis, easily comprehensible for the few Americans now alive who remember the moral crisis of 1864 in our own Civil War, but difficult of appreciation by a younger generation now just beginning to feel itself at war and roused by the emotions and by the spirit which roused Britain and France, alike, three years ago.

There has been in this country a full but not exaggerated appraisal of the contribution of France to the common cause. What France did at the Marne, at Verdun and since has commanded American admiration and American sympathy. But in doing full justice to French service in the past four years, we have been and are in danger of dealing a little less fairly with our British ally than the French themselves are dealing with her.

In the present moment it is of utmost importance to remember what have been the sacrifices of Britain in the past two years. Since the opening of the Battle of the Somme, less than two years ago, nearly 2,000,000 British have been killed, wounded and captured. The casualty list of last year was approximately a million, and the costs of the present German offensive to the British have already passed the 300,000 mark. Such a tax upon the manhood of a country, such a drain upon its vital resources, can hardly be expressed in cold statistics.

In this period, too, there have been for the British the same disappointments which there were for the North in the years separating Antietam from Cold Harbor. Precisely as the people of the North saw, first with surprise and finally with unmistakable depression, the great armies which they had raised, equipped, filled with the best of their youth, fail to win a decision, exactly as the North, entering the campaign of 1864 with high hopes and utmost confidence, saw Grant's campaign from the Rapidan to Cold Harbor fail of its larger purpose, the British have seen a larger army, containing a vastly greater percentage of their manhood, miss the decision which they expected.

Britain is meeting her disappointments as we of the North met ours half a century ago—and the Civil War was won by the political campaign of 1864, which ended in the reëlection of Lincoln and the demonstration that the mass of the plain people of the North meant to fight it out to victory. The same spirit is unmistakable in England now. The disappointments are real, the disillusionments are patent, the burden of the war is provoking the same complaints which were heard in the North after the Virginia campaign of 1864 had led to the bloody shambles of Cold Harbor, after the indecisive slaughters at Spottsylvania and the Wilderness.

And in consequence, of all moments, this is the one in which it is necessary that the British should feel our sympathy and our confidence, not our criticism. Of this the British are having enough at home. The sole value of criticism now or at any other time must be to eliminate apathy, to abolish incompetents and to arouse new effort—and in all these respects the British press and the British people are performing their tasks to the uttermost.

It is for us, in America, newly roused to the gravity of the present crisis, with strength still unshaken, still happily freed from the weight of a blood tax measured by hundreds of thousands of lives, to see to it that we contribute nothing to depressing and everything that is possible to heartening our allies, who must still do work which we could and should have performed had we awakened to the demands of duty promptly. Only a German purpose can be served now by criticism, criticism of those who are doing their best at frightful cost and under the most disheartening of all circumstances—an unexpected defeat.

The alliance between Britain, France and the United States is not merely or primarily an arrangement of expediency limited in its life to the years of the war. It is already plain that if it serves the immediate purpose it must serve an even greater purpose by bringing about a permanent association founded upon mutual respect, common ideals and the enduring task of defending our civilization against German dangers which will not end with the close of the war and may be as acute as ever in a few years after peace is restored.

Our men are on their way, but they cannot arrive in time to take over any considerable share of the burden of this year's campaign. The great cost of this German offensive has been borne by the British. Aided by French devotion and promptness, the British have for the moment checked the rush, but there is certain to be a new flood and a new crisis. And it is for us, who cannot much aid in checking this, to demonstrate utterly to our British ally our confidence, our sympathy, our enduring and generous understanding of what the effort and the spirit are and how terrific is the cost in the best lives of a manhood already heavily taxed.

All that we most care for in the present and the future depends upon the preservation of the alliance not merely of arms, but of sympathy between the three great peoples now engaged as allies in Picardy and Flanders. And of these three, we, who are the richest in men and treasure, are so far doing the least. Criticism from us now is not alone undeserved, but unworthy. And upon such criticism the German will seize to make propaganda both abroad and at home.

The war is to be won only by the unselfish, uncomplaining and undoubting efforts of the three great nations now fighting upon the Western front. Today as yesterday the heaviest weight of the storm is upon the British, to-morrow we may take some of the burden off, the burden of attack, but now, when all depends upon the holding of the line, there must be and there should be an effort on the part of every American to make those who at the risk of life are holding it, shedding their blood without stint and without hesitation, realize how deep is our sense of obligation to them and how unqualified our confidence and our admiration.

Georgia's Lynch Law

Even amid all the war horrors of which we must read daily until we grow a little callous it is permissible to express some horror at the lynching of a colored woman in Georgia. Her crime was apparently her vehement denunciation of the lynching of her own husband the day before on the mere accusation of being concerned in the murder of a white man. It will be observed that here was no suggestion of a crime committed, nor the remotest connection with the one crime which is supposed to condone these barbarous performances in the South.

Dr. Moton, president of Tuskegee Institute, has given wide publicity to the fact that from one-quarter to one-third of the lynchings of negroes occur in the State of Georgia. In 1916, the last year for which we have seen figures, fourteen out of fifty-four were in that state.

In 1916 all save one of the fifty-four lynchings were in Southern states and fifty of the victims were negroes. Attorney General Gregory's state, Texas, stood second to Georgia, with a total of nine. Only one in four of the fifty-four was for the crime of rape.

Our First Army

Our first army in France will have a strength of 200,000. It will be the largest army unit in the field. That is because, while greatly enlarging our regiments, we have clung to the old formula of three regiments to a brigade, three brigades to a division and three divisions to an army corps.

In the Civil War the standard brigade consisted of three regiments of 1,000 men each. Three brigades constituted a division and three divisions a corps. The paper strength of a corps was 27,000. But in fact it fell far below that figure, because regimental losses were not replaced and brigades and regiments quickly became skeletonized. In the Army of the Potomac in 1863 the average corps strength was under 15,000. The First Corps had only about 10,000 men. It was so reduced after the battle of Gettysburg that it was found advisable to consolidate it with another corps.

The Confederate army corps which fought at Gettysburg were much larger. Their numbers were maintained by the device of putting more than three regiments into a brigade and more than three brigades into a division. A three-brigade division nowadays is larger than the army corps used to be. The regiment is 3,000 strong, the brigade over 9,000. The division comprises, with the auxiliary services, more than 30,000 men, and with three divisions a corps runs up to about 100,000. The new American army in France will have two such corps.

Our organization departs widely from that of the Continental armies. The German division is now down to 12,000 on paper—to less than that in reality. The brigade is ignored in the most modern scheme of organization: A colonel commands a French or German regiment; the next officer above him is a general of division—what we call a major general. Four regiments constitute a German division. Five regiments constitute a French division. Six regiments constitute a British division. With three divisions a Continental corps would run in strength from 36,000 to 45,000. But armies are usually constituted of a varying number of divisions, the intermediate corps formation being set aside.

Our first army will be an imposing military body. Its organization may be found in practice to be too complicated, and the division units may eventually be reduced in size in order to insure greater mobility. It is to be composed of the American troops which have seen longest service in France and whose mettle has been tested on the Champagne and Lorraine fronts. It will do us credit. "The Yanks are coming" will take on a new meaning when its 200,000 are thrown as a separate unit into the fight.

Exit Railroad Presidents

The Director General of Railroads is always sudden and unexpected. Out of hand, as part of a day's work in his bedchamber, he fires all the railroad presidents. Federal directors will be put in their stead. Some of the same men may be appointed to the new task, but they will not be presidents any more. They will be government agents, responsible only to the Director General, much in the same way, we suppose, that the president of a bankrupt railroad is appointed receiver and becomes responsible not to the stockholders but to the court. Things then continue to go on very much as before. So it will be in this case. You will have gone to sleep in your Pullman at New York and you will have got up and tipped your porter at Washington without the slightest physical notice that anything unusual has happened. Then it will seem, on second thought, a detail of government operation. Largely it is. The railroad presidents really lost their jobs the day the government took over the railroads. They have had almost nothing to do since except to sit in unease and draw their pay. Their position was uncomfortable. They were responsible to their stockholders and powerless. They could take orders only from the Director General. There were bound to be instances of bad grace. That would be only human. This outcome was perhaps inevitable. It will be objected that Mr. McAdoo's action is arbitrary. Possibly so. But he must have the faults of his virtues. The courage to be arbitrary is dynamic. If Mr. McAdoo had not that quality he would not be a successful Director General of Railroads, in addition to his other responsibilities. When he says he was unable to escape the conclusion that the presidents should go, a strong presumption arises in his favor, because, so far, as is generally conceded, he has done a very good job of directing half the railroad mileage of the world.

The Case of Rose Pastor Stokes

The trial of Mrs. Graham Phelps Stokes at Kansas City for seditious utterances presents features of unusual interest. Alone among all the group which we might without any disrespect term the *dilettante* Socialists, as opposed to the working class Socialists, Mrs. Stokes has elected to take up arms, as it were, against the government, imperil her liberty and her standing in the community, and that of her husband as well.

Mr. Graham Phelps Stokes, like his wife, is an ardent Socialist, but, like Mr. William English Walling, Mr. John Spargo, Mr. Charles Edward Russell and others prominent in this movement, he has taken a resolute stand for the war and is first sergeant of the 9th Coast Artillery, New York Guard. Some time before Mrs. Stokes took up her recent crusade, which resulted in her present predicament, Sergeant Stokes, if we may accentuate his military adhesion to the war, announced his dissociation from his wife's views and those of other Socialists like Mr. Hillquit.

Between the two groups there is at least this difference of complexion, that men like Stokes, Walling, Russell, Spargo and the others are American born, while Mr. Hillquit, Mrs. Stokes and the other *intransigeants* are foreigners. They have come to America not to accept our institutions, but to reform them.

But is this radical impulsion all that drove Mrs. Stokes vehemently to deny her adhesion to the government and to proclaim her opposition to "a government of profiteers"? As many of our readers are aware, the last few years have seen the development of a new technique of psychic investigation which has shed a flood of light upon the nature and origin of these ideas of revolt and the overturn of existing conditions.

In a fascinating new work upon the subject of morbid fears and compulsions Dr. Horace Westlake Frink has analyzed a number of these impulsions in a way to make them seem veritable revelations. He cites the case, for example, of a very ardent young feminist who, at the remotest suggestion even of woman's muscular inferiority or the like, would burst into a storm of denunciation. It was equally striking that her routine work for "the cause" betrayed marked inefficiency and disorder. It was not long after that this showed itself in the outbreak of a decided neurosis—that is, in irrational acts.

Treatment of the case according to the new methods of psycho-analysis disclosed the existence of what is termed a strong masochistic trend—that is, an ardent desire to *suffer* pain. This, it should be added, is a familiar symptom in such neuroses, and in milder forms is so widespread, even among very intelligent and cultivated people, that it carries no such stigma of perversity as once attached to it.

Dr. Frink discusses similar cases, and concludes that practically all the pioneers and reformers, to say nothing of the rebels against authority or prevalent conditions, are of a highly neurotic type and invariably reveal some neurosis in a greater or less degree. In a word, they are the types that are unable to adjust comfortably to their surroundings. They are tormented souls, torn with feelings of rebellion and disgust against an imperfect and incomprehensible world. The curious matter is that these feelings seem to spring invariably from what have come to be known as "complexes," a word that may best be defined as a bundle of rather fixed and compelling emotions. The most familiar examples, and literally those that make for the larger amount of the disquiet and discomfort that a vast number of people feel, are simply exaggerations of such familiar and wholly normal attachments as a boy's love for his mother or a girl's admiration for her father.

In the light of this new knowledge, we venture to think that a case like Mrs. Stokes's is rather for the psychologist than for a Federal judge or District Attorney, who maye be counted upon to be totally and invincibly ignorant of any such things. It must be a wellnigh irresistible drive or torment which would lead a woman of this type, rising by marriage from extreme poverty to affluence, to disregard, not the traditional or orthodox family ties, but the basic ones of affection and regard, and stormily and with such utter futility to throw herself against the main trends of a hundred million people, numbering among these certainly millions of people as intelligent and imbued with as high a sense of social justice as she. It implies, of course, equally an inordinately exaggerated ego. But there are millions of such egos which are not impelled to a conflict with the national authorities. The impulsion must be elsewhere.

The "sedition" of a person of this type is not, to our view, to be taken very seriously, and even the clumsiness of lawyer-made and lawyer-doled law will hardly, we imagine, regard this instance as threatening the institutions or the foundations of the United States.

The Professional Amateur

Everybody was rooting for the Washington Square Players when they first set sail. "Here are pioneers!" we said; "goodness knows there are plenty of unvisited theatrical shores to be explored in this city of much convention!" Now that they have failed, everybody is wondering why. Various reasons, including the war, helped, but we suspect the underlying cause was a very simple one—that you cannot be both a professional and an amateur in the same breath.

The Washington Square Players sold their amateur birthright for the chance of Broadway. They retained much of their old amateur pretension, but their outlook, their plays, their productions were necessarily colored by the Broadway viewpoint. Grant that their intentions continued of the noblest. You cannot long stay an amateur at heart in a box office atmosphere. Nor did these experimenters ever become real professionals. They lost the enthusiasm and independence of the amateur and they never achieved the finished technique of the professional.

Must the amateur always thus collapse? Not if his own or his angel's bank account holds out, the cynic will say. But that is not the whole story. Amateurs are valuable folk. They furnish the most intelligent of publics, and in a hidebound art they can and often do start something. They seldom last to create a great movement or achieve any large creative work.

"For where your treasure is there will your heart be also," is not without its artistic bearing. It might seem as if all a man needed was freedom from money cares and wives and brats to do his noblest work. But he doesn't, as a rule. Goodness knows how many major works of art received their primary impulse from the rent collector! We can be thankful for our intelligent amateurs. But it is great professionals that we really need in every art.

To Mrs. Skeffington

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Somebody who understands the American people and those of us who by birth or extraction, or by the conviction that free government and individual liberty are not merely consistent with but necessarily include religious liberty, sympathize with the Irish cause and deplore the long-standing conflict between Great Britain and Ireland, who hopes to see it ended to Ireland's benefit and satisfaction and who is also in the confidence of Mrs. Skeffington—somebody with these qualifications ought very quickly to tell her that she would better quit.

It is not that she or the Mr. Mellowes who got the Friends of Irish Freedom into such great excitement at their meeting Sunday afternoon can really accomplish here what Germany hopes they can. It is not that they are dangerous to our people here. It is that by giving to the German militarists an opportunity of misrepresenting in German newspapers and German proclamations to the German people the conditions existing here their work here tends to prolong the war and tends to increase the sacrifices that all the democratic peoples are making in life and in their needed savings. We cannot permit that. We are not going to permit it, and the Friends of Irish Freedom must make up their minds to stop their propaganda, and stop it now, or else to join the Friends of German Villany in internment camps.

With the Irish people represented here by such men as Morgan O'Brien, Victor Dowling, John Quinn, Bourke Cockran, Victor Herbert—I could go on with a list that would fill this column—with the religion of Ireland preached in this country by such men as Cardinal Gibbons, Cardinal Farley, Cardinal O'Connell and Archbishop Ireland—and I could go on with a list of bishops and priests that would fill the paper—with such soldiers actually in the war as that immortal 69th, no sensible person can suppose that the interests of the United States at home are being embarrassed by Mrs. Skeffington or this Mellowes person.

But, Mrs. Skeffington, you must see that because your husband was killed I do not want you to do things that prolong the war. From what I have heard of you I sympathize with you intensely and respect you very much, but I would try to gag you before I would let you say again that the way for the Irish in America to help the Irish in Ireland is by transferring the Irish vote here from the Democratic to the Republican party, and that candidates for office must be blacklisted who sustain our President, and that his silence concerning your Sinn Féin rebellion is criminal.

It may be that this is not what you said, for I was not at your meeting and did not hear you say it, but it is the sense of the newspaper reports of what you said. The German militarists, the German newspapers, can get these reports, circulate them throughout Germany, accompany them with stories of the furor you did not raise, and never can raise, in this country, but the furor that they will say you did raise, and the publication of those things in Germany will encourage the German people to further excesses in their iniquities, and that might result, you see, in my son and the sons of thousands of other Americans being killed—Americans who are sorry for you and who are earnest in their sympathy with Home Rule in Ireland.

Now, Mrs. Skeffington, you must see that you must stop it. Whether you are conscious of it or not, whether you mean to be or not, whatever your provocation, short-sighted or long-sighted as you may be in respect of the cause of universal liberty, your husband is dead, and I, and the millions of Americans for whom I am trying to speak, have got our sons, our husbands, our men of every degree and relationship—we have got them to think of, and you must stop.

LEMUEL ELY QUIGG.

New York, May 20, 1918.

Coiled in the Flag Hear s-s-s-s-s t

New York American, March 23, 1917.

Everybody knows that Wall Street financiers have been using all their influence, openly and secretly, to get the United States entangled in this European war. . . .

You can see Wall Street's underground wires when you read the arguments, now commencing to appear, that the United States should fill the Allies' bankrupt coffers. . . .

Now, we propose to fight this proposition right now and clear through to the end. . . .

This proposition that we shall finance the Allies and send our boys for cannon fodder is a Wall Street proposition, and nothing else.

What these dollar patriots are striving for is to have the shaky foreign securities they have gambled in and invested in made safe and valuable by being backed by America's credit. . . .

Let the Allies fight their own war.

We did not start it, and it is none of our business to prosecute it for them.

THE VAMPIRE OF EUROPE

It is reported that the Germans are prepared to swallow 1½ million casualties in the present offensive.

Germany's Conscience

It Is Maximilian Harden

A dispatch to "The Times" from Amsterdam says that Maximilian Harden, in his paper, "Die Zukunft," has scathingly attacked Germany's peace with Rumania as futile, unjust and immoral, for which he may be suppressed again.

(*From The New Europe*)

THE "Zukunft," founded, owned and edited by Maximilian Harden, is a weekly periodical, the attitude and the influence of which are sometimes misunderstood in England.

In order to understand the position of Harden's paper it is necessary to know something about Harden himself. He is the son of a former Berlin Municipal Councillor, of Jewish race, from Galicia, whose name was Wittkopsky. The father, according to Harden's own account in a kind of apologia which he once published in reply to personal attacks, was a domestic tyrant, from whose house Harden fled at an early age, fifteen or sixteen, and joined a company of strolling players. From this time on he had to depend on himself for his education. He meanwhile changed his name for that of Harden, as a brother of his, now a prominent Berlin financier—who, by the way, has been mentioned in connection with the Lichnowsky memorandum—had changed his for that of Witting. Returning ultimately to Berlin, Harden at first attempted to obtain permanent employment as a journalist. He was at that time, like his father before him, a Berlin Radical, and he submitted some of his work to the editor of the "Berliner Tageblatt" (Theodor Wolff's predecessor), who did not employ him, but assured him that he had in him the makings of a great satirist.

By Bismarck

The decisive event in Harden's political life was his conversion to Bismarckianism, which led to his publication of a collected series of essays under the appropriate nom de plume of "Apostata." Shortly after Bismarck's retirement, in March, 1890, the "Zukunft" was founded, and Harden, presumably through the agency of Schweninger, Bismarck's doctor, entered the then narrow political circle of the ex-Chancellor's intimates, and became one of the leading exponents of his views in the press.

Harden's campaigns against successive German Chancellors and governments and against the monarch himself showed that, with sufficiently influential backing, it is possible, even in Prussia, to conduct a violent and even virulent agitation against the men in power. But, of course, Bismarck's position and influence were incomparable.

An Erratic Bow

The secret of the attraction of the "Zukunft" for German and other readers is the political license of Harden's views, which are not guided by any convention or consistent aim or principle. He constantly draws a bow at a venture, and sometimes by chance, as often as by virtue of his special knowledge or his undoubted flair, he hits the mark.

To read Harden for political guidance is to indulge in a kind of intellectual gamble. For the mass of the educated, and still more for the half-educated, the appearance of erudition—popularized by a somewhat meretricious and allusive style—which the writer contrives to produce, is an additional attraction.

Yet there are one or two fundamental facts which he has perceived more clearly than any of his contemporaries. One is the inadequacy and the peril of William II in the part which he has attempted to play—that of arbiter mundi. Another is the necessity that any parliamentary opposition which is to be at all effective should carry with it the support of the Social Democracy and the toiling masses.

His chief criticism of his idol, Bismarck, is that the great Chancellor did not sufficiently profit by his intercourse with Lassalle, and that for purposes of practical politics the "masses" to whom he appealed did not extend further than the lower middle class.

"Public Opinions"

A main feature of Harden's campaign in recent years has been his reversion to the cult of Parliamentarism as the antidote to personal government and irresponsible influences in Berlin. Here he could cite Bismarck as a belated convert to similar views, for in a speech delivered at Jena toward the end of his life Bismarck had publicly retracted some of his lifelong opinions as to the pernicious character of parliamentary influences when opposed to the Crown.

During the war Harden has maintained an open mind, and has always remained critical in his attitude toward those who are guiding the destinies of Germany. He has otherwise been consistent only in his constant inconsistency, advocating at one time the public proclamation of Germany's responsibility for the outbreak of war and more lately showing himself very dubious as to the wisdom of war à outrance and of a policy which has ranged nearly the whole world in hostility to the Central Powers.

The value of Harden's articles is mainly that of an index to what he, a shrewd observer of the public mind, considers may very well be the second thoughts of a large section of educated German opinion on any leading question of the day. He is not invariably right, but on occasion he serves as a corrective to the more obvious and commonplace conclusions at which the newspaper press (for which he has a profound contempt) is wont to jump. It is only very rarely that he himself is a creator of opinion.

Indeed, he is a confirmed skeptic as to the value or even the reality of what is conventionally called "public opinion." He prefers to speak in the plural of "public opinions," and considers it the business of the statesman or the political writer to disentangle the right ones.